



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*[Handwritten signature]*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/985,993	11/07/2001	Jacky Peng		4612

7590  
Jack PENG  
PO Box 82-144  
Taipei,  
TAIWAN

01/26/2004

EXAMINER  
FERGUSON, LAWRENCE D

ART UNIT  
PAPER NUMBER

1774

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/985,993

Applicant(s)

PENG, JACKY

Examiner

Lawrence D Ferguson

Art Unit

1774

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 18 December 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  
(a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.  
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 9

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
10. ☒ Other: Claims 5-8 are cancelled

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Mr. Peng combines claims 5-8 to form new claim 9. Newly added claim 9 maintains the phrase "light absorbing polymer granules with different irregular shapes" which is not supported by the specification. There is no mention of granules with different irregular shapes. The specification only points to articles that have different shapes. The two are not the same. Additionally, Mr. Peng argues the stone of Sakai cannot absorb the light emitted from the stone, whereas the present invention can absorb light at the same time of emitting light. Examiner respectfully disagrees because Sakai discloses a light absorbing and emitting composition (column 1, lines 59-61 and column 3, lines 63-64). Mr. Peng further argues the reference fails to disclose a light absorbing and emitting composition consisting of a transparent or translucent substrate and a plurality of light absorbing polymer granules with different irregular shapes which are well mixed together to a composition for making articles with desired shapes. Examiner is not persuaded by this argument because Sakai discloses a light absorbing and emitting composition (column 1, lines 59-61 and column 3, lines 63-64) comprising a transparent component that is mixed having granules of light storing materials (column 4, lines 1-2) where the stone (substrate) is transparent (column 4, lines 51-54) and further shows irregular shaped granules (2) in Figure 1. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the particles are well mixed together since they have been mixed into a resin. The reference at column 8 states the stone containing the particle was visible for a long time, which meets applicant's limitation that emitting brighter light for a time period, producing variation in visual effect. This only means it does not light continuously. The reference teaches the same. For these reasons the rejection is maintained for reasons of record.

